

Mr. Speaker, we in this Congress must change the philosophy of the Federal Government to regulate every facet of our lives. Throughout our deliberations we must be conscious of the small businessman. I will say to my friend, TONY HALL, I was a small businessman too when I came here, so-called little guy, who just happens to create 75 percent of all the new jobs in America every single year, 75 percent of the new jobs.

H.R. 926 will help free the small businessman from these kind of burdensome, job-killing regulations and direct the President to enact a citizens regulatory bill of rights, something he does not appear to want to do.

□ 2000

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 926 amends the Regulatory Flexibility Act which sought to ensure that agencies fit regulations and informational requirements to the scale of the business or organization or governmental jurisdictions subject to regulation.

This is based on the idea that the size of an entity significantly affects the cost of regulatory compliance. In other words, what that means is, regulations have a greater cost on smaller business than they do on larger business.

This bill also will require Federal agencies to produce a regulatory impact analysis for regulations with an economic impact of more than \$50 million, which means that the Federal Government will be more aware of the effect proposed rules will have on business.

For example, the EPA is threatening thousands of jobs in upstate New York in the district which regulates, that sets emission standards for the pulp and paper industry. The EPA regulations were created without a cost-benefit analysis. Now, the costs of the same regulations are now threatening to close paper mills in my hometown of Glens Falls, NY, killing jobs and placing many hard-working people on the unemployment rolls.

Let me tell my colleagues, in upstate northern New York, where it is so cold there are few jobs up there, we cannot afford to lose one more much less thousands.

I would like to finish my statement by pointing out that there appears to be a great deal of consensus on this bill. I understand that both Republican and Democrat amendments were adopted in the committee, that the bill was favorably reported out of committee by a voice vote and that the rule was unanimously voted out of the Committee on Rules. That does not always happen. But when we have an open rule like this, it is a pleasure to bring it to the floor.

With that, I urge strong support of the rule on this much-needed bill.

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I have no requests for time, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GEKAS], a member of the Committee on the Judiciary who chairs the subcommittee that reported this legislation.

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

The gentleman from Colorado, aided and abetted by the gentleman from Ohio and later by the gentleman from New York have very amply outlined the parameters of the legislation in the debate that is forthcoming as we begin the process again tomorrow.

What I wanted to add to their preview is what has been generally understood, that this is from the very beginning a bipartisan effort, at least to bring the issue to the floor.

In the committee, where hearings, extensive hearings were held, the testimony was such that it actually created the basis for the final language that appears in this legislation.

Members will recall that the original bill, which we changed as bit, had reference to an executive order issued by then-President Reagan. It formed the level of provisions that were found in the bill that was referred to our committee. But we, working together, were able to provide a new bill reflecting the best of the executive orders, adding some zest of our own into the process and listening very carefully to the witnesses on the whole host of issues that found themselves resolved in the final language.

This does not mean that all of the issues were resolved. The gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. REED] and I have agreed that there is going to be disagreement. We also have agreed that jointly we are going to offer an en bloc amendment that will satisfy some of the other problems which we encountered and which we jointly decided to resolve.

After that, who knows what is going to happen, but in the final analysis, when we have completed this bill, we will have gone a long way in bringing to fruition another part of the Contract With America which just happens to coincide with the will of many of the Members on the Democratic side who never even knew about the Contract With America and who are not, of course, signatories of the Contract With America, but who have the joint feel for the necessity to do something about regulatory reform.

We will begin tomorrow. I will end by thanking now in advance, because I might be angered by the time debate is over tomorrow, but I will now thank the gentleman from Rhode Island for his cooperation and all those who will be participating.

I will save my anger for those who oppose me tomorrow.

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GEKAS. I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, I, too, want to thank the gentleman for his cooperation today, and I look forward to tomorrow and for a vigorous debate.

Mr. GEKAS. Vigorous and vitriolic, maybe.

Mr. REED. And educational.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KNOLLENBERG). Under the Speaker's announced policy on January 4, 1995, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members are recognized for 5 minutes each.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. WHITFIELD] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. WHITFIELD addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Ms. KAPTUR] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Ms. KAPTUR addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

FACTS ON WIC AND THE SCHOOL LUNCH PROGRAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. CUNNINGHAM] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I have got an article here from the Washington Times, and it says "Democrats Lie About Lunch." And I would like to submit it for the RECORD, and I would like to explain what the article means.

First of all, there has been a lot of politically motivated criticism and partisan purposeful misrepresentation of the facts. And I think it has gotten to the extreme level, Mr. Speaker. What we have done is kill the big Federal bureaucracy versus putting Government control where it does the most good, and that is at the effective, closest level to the people and taking it out of Washington. And a lot of the Clinton liberals do not like that.

Facts: The school-based block grant ensures that increased funding levels for the school breakfast and lunch, that funding level is increased by 4.5 percent. CBO had originally requested or taken a look and said the average